



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,449	07/08/2003	Robert T. Baum	01-1518	1038

25537 7590 01/08/2008
VERIZON
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP
1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 500
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909

EXAMINER

LIPMAN, JACOB

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

01/08/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/616,449

Applicant(s)

BAUM, ROBERT T.

Examiner

Jacob Lipman

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 32-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The examiner has considered the information disclosure statements (IDSs) submitted on 22 August 2007 and 16 November 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a-n international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 1-3, 5-8 and 14-17 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tuck et al., USPN US 2004/0249975.

With regard to claims 1 and 15, Tuck discloses a security method (0013) for use in a communication system ([0040]), the method comprising: receiving an IP packet including a source address and a destination address ([0055], [0061]), obtaining physical location information indicating the location of a user device which is the source of said IP packet ([0081]) prior to delivery of the packet to the destination address ([0056]), and determining, as a function of the obtained physical location information, an action to be taken ([0116]).

With regard to claim 2, Tuck discloses comparing the address to stored addresses for security ([0013]).

With regard to claims 3, 5, 17, and 32 Tuck discloses dropping the packet, and reporting an error if the location does not match ([0017]), and forwarding it if it does ([0119]).

With regard to claim 6, Tuck discloses getting location information from a database ([0116]).

With regard to claims 7 and 8 Tuck discloses using router and port information ([0073]).

With regard to claims 14 and 16, Tuck discloses applying security based on requested resource and the user attempting to access it ([0013]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4, 18, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuck in view of Anderson et al., USPN 6,684,250.

With regard to claims 4 and 18, Tuck discloses the method of claim 2, as outlined above, but does not disclose the specific service being requested. Anderson discloses one content is video on demand (column 1 lined 20-22). It would have obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the firewall of Tuck to the video system of Anderson to protect it from intrusion.

With regard to claims 33 and 34, Tuck discloses the method of claim 32, as outlined above, but does not mention notifying the police. The examiner takes official notice that it is well known to inform the police about possible fraud. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to notify the police when detecting fraud in Tuck and to give them all known information, for the motivation of enforcing justice.

With regard to claim 35, Tuck discloses using the MAC address ([0012]).

5. Claims 9-13, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuck in view of Anderson in further view of Igval, USPub 2002/0165835 A1.

With regard to claim 9-13, 36, and 37, Tuck in view of Anderson discloses conducting a fraud check, but does not disclose a scheduled location-reporting message. Anderson does not disclose tracking the location or movement of a specific device, but is interested in the location of a message origin. Igval discloses using a geographical locating system, ([0027]) to determine if a device is in an expected location, and checking for a stolen meter and informing the authorities of its unexpected location ([0028]). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method disclosed by Tuck to protect the postage meter of Igval, for the stated motivation of Igval of locating the device ([0027]). Further, just as Igval wishes to insure postage meters are located in the proper area, it would have been obvious to apply this check by any device that has an expected area.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Lipman whose telephone number is 571-272-3837. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fr.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 571-272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/616,449
Art Unit: 2134


Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JL

JL

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


1/2/08